

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in the instant application after this amendment adds new claims 37 and 38. Claims 1, 2, and 4 are amended herein. No new matter is added by the amendments and new claim, which are supported throughout the specification and figures. In particular, new claim 37 is supported at least by original claim 1, and new claim 38 is supported at least at page 9, lines 18-23, of the specification. In view of the following remarks, favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by EP 0 922 431 to Amano et al. (hereinafter Amano). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,402,616 to Ogata et al. (hereinafter Ogata). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 relates to a setup method for a controller that gives instructions to a computer running software depending on a pushing pressure by a user on a control element connected to a pressure-sensitive device of the controller. The method of claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, an instruction step wherein the user is instructed to push said control element with at least a maximum strength, and a storage step wherein a value obtained when said control element is pushed by the user, is stored as the maximum value. The method of amended claim 1 further includes ***a correction step*** wherein, based on said maximum value ***and a pressure-sensing value table defined in said software***, a new corrected pressure-sensing value table is generated.

The Office Action relies on Amano as alleged disclosure of the correction step recited in the claim. In particular, the Office Action cites to Amano at col. 14, lines 27-32 and col. 17, lines 3-5 (Office Action; page 3, lines 1-5). However, Amano relates to determining the pressure of an individual when applying pressure in order to read a pulse on an individual. Amano apparently

measures pressure being exerted by an individual, and sets up a chart based on the results of the measurement. Amano discloses a touch detecting device, as in Figure 4, used to detect the grip state when an individual grips an object (paragraph 0001). The touch detecting device in Amano apparently includes a calibration table 50 used when detecting touch, a threshold value table 51 used when grading touch information, and a data register 52 for storing various data (Amano; paragraph 0072). When a CPU 4 displays the message “Please apply more force” on LCD 108, a user presses pressure sensor 11 with maximal force. At this time Pmax, the maximum value for the degree of pressure, and Lmin, the minimum value for the DC component, are detected (Amano; paragraph 0087). Then, the CPU 4 reads out the maximum value Pmax for the degree of pressure from data register 52, equally divides maximum value Pmax in response to the number of gradings, and determines each of the threshold values for the degree of pressure (paragraph 0088). However, as is apparent from Amano, col. 32, lines 25-29, calibration table 50 is NOT prepared beforehand, but is rather generated *as a result* of a pressure sensor measurement.

In contrast, in the instant invention, as in Fig. 1A, when the maximum value that can be achieved by a user is measured for each individual user, the correction is performed such that the maximum value *corresponds* to the maximum setting *set in advance* for a game or other type of software, etc., and the intermediate values are calculated proportionally (Specification; page 9, lines 8-13). By using the game pressure-sensing values corresponding to the user pressure-sensing values as the corrected user pressure-sensing values, problems due to the difference in body weights among individual users may be avoided (Specification; page 9, lines 20-23). In Amano, the maximum value Pmax is merely equally divided in response to the number of gradings, while in the instant invention the maximum value is *first made to correspond to the*

maximum setting set in advance for a game or other type of software, etc., and *then the intermediate values are calculated proportionally*. Amano does not disclose or suggest any correspondence made between the maximum value by a user and *the maximum setting set in advance for a game*, and therefore Amano does not disclose or suggest a correction step wherein, based on said maximum value and *a pressure-sensing value table defined in said software, a new corrected pressure-sensing value table is generated*. Therefore, for at least this reason claim 1 is allowable.

Independent claims 2, 4, 8, 12, 17, 21, 24, 30, and 34-36 include feature similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 1, and therefore each of these claims is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.

Each of the remaining dependent claims includes the feature of the independent claims from which they depend, and therefore each of these claims is allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claim is allowable.

Additionally, in connection with claim 8, which recites *means for acquiring a maximum game pressure-sensing value set by said software*, and correction means for making said maximum user pressure-sense value to correspond to said maximum game pressure-sense value, and calculating intermediate values until the maximum user pressure-sensing value is reached proportionally corresponding to the game pressure-sensing values, Applicants submit that Amano does not disclose *acquiring a game pressure-sensing value set by software* since Amano does not disclose a game, nor a pressure value set by a software. Therefore, for at least this reason claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 9-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,347,997 to Armstrong (hereinafter Armstrong). Claims 34-36 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata and Amano in view of Armstrong. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Armstrong has a filing date of May 10, 2000. With the filing of the certified translation of the priority document, the instant application claims the full benefit of the priority date of the instant application, namely January 14, 2000. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Armstrong is not prior art with respect to the instant application, and the rejections based on Armstrong are obviated.

New claims 37 and 38 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.

Additionally, new claim 38 recites that the new corrected pressure-sensing value table is used when the computer executes the software to correct the pushing pressure by the user to a corrected pushing pressure value. Since Amano does not relate to correcting a pressure *during* execution of software, Amano does not disclose or suggest the features of new claim 38, and therefore the new claim is allowable for at least this additional reason.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Pedro C. Fernandez/

Pedro C. Fernandez

Reg. No. 41,741

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-6311

Fax: (212) 940-8986

Docket No.: SCEI 17.966 (100809-16191)

PCF:fd